

2024677-7033292001

REMARKS

Amendments to claims 1, 16, 31, 42, 44, and 55 are for the purpose of clarifying what Applicant regards as the invention. No new matter has been added.

I. Claim rejection under § 102**Matz**

Claims 42-47 and 49-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,683,581 (Matz). Applicant respectfully notes that in order to sustain a claim rejection under § 102, each of the claimed elements must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

Claim 42 has been amended to recite a memory unit storing information regarding a position of a stationary base station. Matz does not disclose or suggest such limitation. Rather, Matz discloses an antenna 20 that is configured to receive output signal from a satellite 14, wherein the antenna 20 is oriented by aligning its centerline axis with the satellite's output signal (column 7, lines 48-52). Since Matz discloses obtaining signal (a position indicating signal) from a satellite, it does not disclose or suggest a memory unit for storing information regarding a position of a stationary base station, and in fact, teaches away from such limitation. Also, Matz discloses a satellite 14 (Fig. 1), which is not a stationary base station. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 42 and its dependent claim 43 are believed allowable over Matz.

Claim 44 recites a method, which includes the step of adjusting a position or orientation of the antenna based on information regarding a position of a stationary base station. Matz does not disclose or suggest such a method. As discussed, Matz discloses aligning an antenna based on a position of a satellite, which is not a stationary base station. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 44 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Matz.

Shintani

Claims 55-56, 59, and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,229,480 (Shintani). Claim 55 recites determining data associated with a desired mounting configuration of an antenna, wherein the data is determined based on a

2024677-7033292001

positional information of a base station. Shintani does not disclose or suggest such limitation. Rather, Shintani discloses a procedure for obtaining acceptable antenna orientation information (Fig. 4), wherein the acceptable or optimum orientation of the antenna 122 for each channel is determined based on information pertaining to the BER, C/N, equalizer tap coefficients, AGC level, Reed-Solomon error correction code (column 4, line 46 to column 5, line 49), none of which is a positional information of a base station. As such, the acceptable orientation of the antenna in Shintani is not determined based on a positional information of a base station, as recited in claim 55. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 55 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Shintani.

II. Claim rejection under § 103

Claims 1-41 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matz in view of Shintani.

Claims 1 and 16 recite a memory unit for storing data that comprises information regarding a position of a stationary base station. Neither Matz nor Shintani discloses or suggests the above limitation. As discussed, Matz discloses receiving position indicating signal directly from a satellite, and therefore, does not disclose or suggest, but in fact teaches away from, storing positional information of a station in a memory unit. Also, Matz discloses a satellite 14 (Fig. 1), which is not a stationary base station. Shintani also does not disclose or suggest the above limitations, and therefore fails to make up the deficiencies present in Matz. In particular, there is nothing in Shintani that discloses or suggests storing information regarding a position of a stationary base station in a memory unit. Since neither Matz nor Shintani discloses or suggests the above limitations, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1 and 16. For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 16, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Matz, Shintani, and their combination.

Claim 31 recites data that is obtained using a positional data of a stationary base station. Neither Matz nor Shintani discloses or suggests such limitation. As discussed, Shintani discloses a procedure for obtaining acceptable antenna orientation information (Fig. 4), wherein the acceptable or optimum orientation of the antenna 122 for each channel is determined based on information pertaining to the BER, C/N, equalizer tap coefficients, AGC level, Reed-Solomon

2024677-7033292001

error correction code (column 4, line 46 to column 5, line 49), none of which is a positional data of a base station. As such, the acceptable orientation of the antenna in Shintani is not determined based on a positional data of a base station. Matz also does not disclose or suggest the above limitation, and therefore, cannot be combined with Shintani to form the resulting subject matter of claim 31. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 31 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Matz, Shintani, and their combination.

2024677-7033292001

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this response, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7010755001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7010755001.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: February 1, 2006

By: 

Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Ste. PL2
San Francisco, California 94111-4074
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800